



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/387,569	09/01/1999	GEORGE POLITIS	169.1423	2749

5514 7590 09/05/2002

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

GOOD JOHNSON, MOTILEWA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/387,569	POLITIS, GEORGE	
	<b>Examiner</b> Motilewa A. Good-Johnson	<b>Art Unit</b> 2672	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2002.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-76 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                 |                                                                              |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)            | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: application, filed on 09/01/1999; Request for reconsideration, paper #8, filed on 12/17/2001; IDS, paper #9, filed on 12/31/2001.
2. Claims 1-76 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 14, 25, 38, 49 and 62 are independent claims. Claims 1, 14, 25, 38, 49 and 62 have been amended. Claims 73-76 have been added.
3. The present title of the invention is "Region Based Image Compositing" (as originally filed by applicant).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stone et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,479,603, "Method and Apparatus for Producing a Composite Second Image in the Spatial Context of a First Image", class 345/804, 12/26/1995.

As per independent claim 1, "a method of creating an image . . . comprising the steps of: dividing a space in which said outlines are defined into a plurality region . . . formed by segment of a virtual grid encompassing said space; Stone discloses in col. 4, table 1 and in lines 60-67, an image having a plurality of viewing operation regions, manipulating said regions to determine a plurality of further regions . . . region has a corresponding compositing expression; Stone discloses in col. 4, table 1, a first viewing operation having a non-composite portion and a viewing operation in the first viewing operation region; classifying said further regions according to at least one attribute of said graphical objects within said further regions; Stone discloses in col. 5, lines 34-38; modifying each said corresponding compositing expression according to a classification of said further region . . . ; Stone discloses in col. 5, lines 38-49; and compositing said image using each of said augmented compositing expressions. Stone discloses in figure 25.

With respect to dependent claim 2, ". . . said attribute is selected from the group consisting of colour, opacity and object outline." Stone discloses in col. 16, lines 25-30, attribute data indicating a display feature such as fill colors, outline colors and other visible features, and in col. 23, lines 41-45.

With respect to dependent claim 3, "manipulating said regions comprises applying set operations to said regions." Stone discloses in col. 5, lines 34-38.

With respect to dependent claim 4, ". . . set operations include difference and/or intersection operations." Stone discloses in figure 25, operations for a

composited image including difference and intersection operations, elements 29 and 61.

With respect to dependent claim 5, ". . . grid is regularly spaced and preferably orthogonally based." Stone discloses in figure 11, element 24.

With respect to dependent claim 6, ". . . grid is irregularly shaped." Stone discloses in col. 30, lines 56-57.

With respect to dependent claim 7, ". . . compositing expression is a hierarchically structure representation of the image." Stone discloses in table 1.

With respect to dependent claim 8, "image is at least in part a pixel -based image." Stone discloses in col. 1, lines 47-49.

With respect to dependent claim 9, ". . . a flag is stored to indicate whether data of an object is opaque or ordinary." Chauvin discloses in col. 30, lines 33-34.

With respect to dependent claim 10, ". . . compositing expression is optimized based on a value of said flag for contributing objects." Stone discloses in col. 24, lines 19-33, a criteria selection data item which selects and displays a selected item from the model data structure and tags the object as the selected object.

With respect to dependent claim 11, ". . . wholly opaque object in said region acts to eliminate one or more objects within said region from said compositing expressions." Stone discloses in col. 27, lines 44-46, that the viewing operation may be implemented on a transparent overlay.

With respect to dependent claim 12, ". . . wholly transparent object in said region eliminates at least itself . . ." Stone discloses in col. 24, lines 19-33, a criteria selection data and further discloses in col. 27, lines 44-47, that said viewing operation may be implemented in a transparent overlay, thus allow for transparent tagging or elimination.

With respect to dependent claim 13, ". . . modifying comprises modifying a manner in which said compositing expression is evaluated with modifying said hierarchically structured representation." Stone disclose in col. 31, lines 1-39.

As per independent claims 14, 25, 38, 49 and 62, they are rejected based upon similar rational as above independent claim 1.

With respect to dependent claims 15-24, 39-48 and 63-72, they are rejected based upon similar rational as above dependent claims 2 and 5-13 respectively.

With respect to dependent claims 26-37, 50-61, they are rejected based upon similar rational as above dependent claims 2-13 respectively.

With respect to dependent claim 73-75, Stone discloses in col. 45, lines 10-38, creating what-if model changes and further disclose changes to the model such as adding objects, deleting objects form the model and replacing a display object with a different display object.

As per independent claims 76, a dividing step, of dividing a space in which outlines are defined into a plurality of regions . . . ; Stone discloses in col. graphics editor having a grid feature to aid in spacing and positioning graphical objects and further discloses the grid used within the viewing operation region

Art Unit: 2672

and image segments, col.44, lines 17-38; a manipulation step of manipulating said regions to determine a plurality of further regions; Stone discloses in col. 44, lines 9-16, the viewing operation associated with a viewing operation region and showing interior detail objects; a classification step; Stone discloses in col. 6, lines 50-67, a criteria selection data item and selecting objects based upon the value of the criteria selected; a modification step . . . regions are eliminated from one or more corresponding compositing; Stone discloses in col. 45, lines 10-38, creating what-if model changes and further disclose changes to the model such as adding objects, deleting objects from the model and replacing a display object with a different display object.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 06/19/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Stone fails to disclose region formed by segments of a virtual grid in the space in which outlines are defined. Stone discloses in figures 53-55, and in col. 44, the graphics editor has a grid feature, which the user may control to aid in the spacing and positioning of graphical objects. Stone further discloses a viewing operation associated with the viewing operation region may be implemented to modify the grid display, and moving the position over a new image segment.

Applicant further argues that Stone fails to disclose or suggest an optimized compositing expression for each further region. Stone discloses in col.

Art Unit: 2672

45, functional interaction the user has with the output display objects, and further disclose viewing operation and viewing operation regions for temporally and spatially bounded model changes. Stone discloses reference pointer to object data and modifying by the viewing operation or creating a copy of the model efficient for the viewing operation, col. 45, lines 1-41.

Applicant argues that Stone fails to disclose regions that can be eliminated from the compositing expressions dependent on the classification of the object. Stone discloses that changes to a model may be included such as adding objects to model, deleting objects from the model, and replacing an existing display object representing data in the model, col. 45, lines 33-42.

### ***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Motilewa A. Good-Johnson whose telephone number is (703) 305-3939. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (703) 305-4713. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Motilewa A. Good-Johnson  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2672

mgj  
August 30, 2002

  
MICHAEL RAZAVI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600